

Appl. No. 10/788,745
Amdt. Dated January 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2005

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed November 15, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-8 and 10-29 are pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 22 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 13, 22, 25, 26, and 28 have been amended, mostly in a cosmetic manner, and Claim 9 has been canceled herein. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Initially, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Pang for indicating that Claims 3, 9, 10, 13-15, 17, 18, 21, 25-27, and 29 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 was objected to due to a minor typographical informality. Claim 7 has been amended herein to moot this objection, and its withdrawal is therefore requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, Claims 6 and 8 each recited elements without sufficient antecedent basis. In response, Applicants have amended each claim to provide proper antecedent basis for each element recited therein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejections is therefore respectfully solicited.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, 28, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0025625 (Groszold et al.), and Claims 12 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Griswold et al. and U.S. Patent No. 3,602,602 (Motta). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In response, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 22 to include the feature of as-filed dependent Claim 9, which was indicated in the Office action as being directed

Appl. No. 10/788,745
Amdt. Dated January 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 15, 2005

to allowable subject matter. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 1 and 22 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: January 26, 2006

By: 

Paul D. Amrozowicz
Reg. No. 45,264
(480) 385-5060